

### **REMARKS**

This AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111 is filed in reply to the outstanding Office Action of August 20, 2004, and is believed to be fully responsive thereto for reasons set forth below in greater detail.

Responsive to paragraphs 4-6 of the Office Action, Claims 8 and 10 have been amended to correct the formal rejections.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1-6 and 8-10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,155), and further in view of Saito (U.S. Patent No. 5,900,005), particularly in view of the clarifying and distinguishing amendments to the claims and the following comments on the distinctions and advantages of the present invention relative to the prior art.

The independent claims herein have been amended to specify, with Claim 1 being exemplary, operation detection means for detecting a predetermined specific operation based on a user's operation when said user reads said contents of said data file displayed by said browsing means including an operating event detector that monitors movement of a pointing device such as a mouse by a user on the displayed data file to detect an operating event, and an operating event analyzer that analyzes a string of operating events detected by the operating event detector to extract a specific operation performed by the user, and

means for extracting specific text of the displayed data file that is information that is displayed at a location whereat said specific operation that is detected by said operation detection means is performed on a display screen of said browsing means.

Moreover, dependent Claims 22-28 have been added to specify that the specific operation comprises an operation selected from all of the group of operations of selecting of text, pointing to a link, clicking on a link, tracing and reading in a transverse horizontal direction, tracing and reading in a vertical direction.”

Support for Claims 22-28 is found in the specification at page 21, subparagraphs 1-5, and at page 18, subparagraphs 1-5. Notice that each of Claims 22-28 specifies “an operation selected from of all of the group of operations”, meaning that all five specific operations must be considered, and any one of the five specific operations can trigger the operation detection means.

The major distinctions and advantages of the present invention over the cited prior art are as follows.

#### The Present Invention

The present invention extracts a text string that a user is most interested in, by detecting five specific mouse operations (p. 18 patent application):

- (a) Moving the mouse pointer while a button of the mouse is depressed,
- (b) Pointing the mouse pointer at a link that overlaps a second link,

- (c) Clicking on the link using the mouse,
- (d) Moving the mouse pointer in a transverse direction when text is being read as the mouse pointer is moved along the lines of the text, and
- (e) Using the mouse pointer to designate the line in text that is currently being read, and gradually moving the mouse pointer vertically as each line is read.

The present invention has (1) an operating event detector, (2) an operating event analyzer, and (3) a text extractor. The (1) operating event detector detects basic mouse operations. The (2) operating event analyzer detects one specific operation of all of the above five operations (a)-(e), which are combinations of the basic mouse operations. Then, the (3) text extractor finds a text string that the specific operation is related to.

The present invention uses a proxy server for embedding (1) the operating event detector, (2) the operating event analyzer, and (3) the text extractor.

#### Davis

Davis uses a monitoring program running in a client machine, wherein the monitoring program is embedded when a Web page is being loaded. Davis covers monitoring client use of and interaction with a resource downloaded from a server on a computer network. Davis uses a software timer to monitor (i) the amount of the time the Web page is displayed, (ii) the amount of time a user spends interacting with a portion of a Web page, or (iii) which of the various links are selected. The present invention detects the above five operations (a)-(e), while Davis detects only one, the link selection described in (iii).

While Davis detects only one simple operation, the present invention detects four additional complex operations.

Saito

Saito extracts a text string where a mouse pointer resides. Saito does not detect a user's mouse operation described in (a)-(e). The present invention detects specific mouse operations, and extracts a text string specified by the operations.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that he call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



William C. Roch  
Registration No. 24,972

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
WCR:gc